UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791,335	03/01/2004	Jayasimha Nuggehalli	49986-0535	2410

29989   7590   01/02/2009

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER
RODRIGUEZ, LENNIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/02/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/791,335	NUGGEHALLI ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	LENNIN R. RODRIGUEZ	2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 October 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26 and 28* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26 and 28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/15/2008*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed on 10/15/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's argument regarding "'any type of device' to equate to a multifunction peripheral as recited in Claim 1 constitutes hindsight reasoning. Fig. 25 and its corresponding text describe a data structure residing on a 'printer, copier, or multifunction device,' such as business office devices 268 and 278, and not service machine 254" has been fully considered; in response "Motoyama '247 teaches requesting device-related information from a network device over a network (column 9, lines 4-9, where the service machine request data and where the service machine could be any device and since Homma '700 discloses a multi-function peripheral, the machine is taken to be a multifunction device as stated in the primary reference, and as explained on column 21, lines 15-20 and 26-29, where the data structure resides on a; e.g. multifunction device, that is a possibility since the service machine contains information about another device as well as Fig. 25), it is not considered that the examiner has made hindsight reasoning".

2.   Applicant's argument regarding "the citations to multi-port communication interface 166 in column 7 lines 16- 18, column 8 lines 7-19 and Fig. 4 are with reference to an interface on a digital copier, not service machine 254. Thus even if Motoyama I were combinable with Homma, the resulting combination could only perform bits and pieces of Applicants' claimed method on multiple machines scattered throughout a

network, and not on a single multifunction peripheral as appears in Applicants' claim 1"

has been fully considered; in response "Motoyama '247 teaches receiving device-

related information from the network device over the network (column 8, line 63 through

column 9, line 4, where the service machine receives information through a network 10

of the operations of other devices)".

3.   Applicant has attempted to disqualify reference 7,293,081 (Motoyama et al.)

under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) by showing that the invention was subject to a joint research

agreement at the time this invention was made. However, applicant is reminded that a

continuation application contains the same disclosure as the parent application,

therefore since the parent application (Motoyama 6,631,247) in this case was published

more than a year from the present application, it is the same as if Motoyama '247 was

published on October 7, 2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

5.   Claims 1-4, 9-10, 12-16, 21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Homma (US 2001/0017700) in view of Motoyama et al. (US

6,631,247).

        (1) regarding claim 1:

        Homma '700 discloses a multifunction peripheral (100 in Fig. 1) configured to

perform the steps of:

generating a device-related report based on a device-related information (paragraph [0074], where the information collected is being formatted in a record); and

sending said device-related report to a recipient device (paragraph [0076], lines 6-12, where if the information is stored in memory it is received by the requesting party).

Homma '700 discloses all the subject matter as described above except requesting device-related information from a network device over a network;

receiving device-related information from the network device over the network;

However, Motoyama '247 teaches requesting device-related information from a network device over a network (column 9, lines 4-9, where the service machine request data and where the service machine could be any device and since Homma '700 discloses a multi-function peripheral, the machine is taken to be a multifunction device as stated in the primary reference, and as explained on column 21, lines 15-20 and 26-29, where the data structure resides on a; e.g. multifunction device, that is a possibility since the service machine contains information about another device as well as Fig. 25);

receiving device-related information from the network device over the network (column 8, line 63 through column 9, line 4, where the service machine receives information through a network 10 of the operations of other devices);

Having a system of Homma '700 reference and then given the well-established teaching of Motoyama '247 reference, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the multifunction peripheral system of Homma '700 to include requesting device-related information from a network device over a network and receiving device-related information from the

network device over the network as taught by Motoyama '247 because it would allow the multifunction device to detect other devices on the network and in case the MFP itself could not perform a job, it would know what are the capabilities of other devices in order to redirect or indicate the user where to redirect the job.

(2) regarding claim 2:

Homma '700 further discloses wherein the multifunction peripheral is configured to perform the step of generating the device-related report based on said device- related information based at least in part on the recipient device (paragraph [0074] – [0076], where certain host computer makes the request for information and that information is format in a way that the host computer would understand the information being received).

(3) regarding claim 3:

Homma '700 further discloses wherein the multifunction peripheral further comprises a faxing module (4 in Fig. 1) and the multifunction peripheral is configured to perform the step of sending the device-related report by sending the device-related report Via fax using the faxing module (paragraph [0036], where the core part controls the transmission of information, among others, of the facsimile portion).

(4) regarding claim 4:

Homma '700 further discloses wherein the multifunction peripheral further comprises a network connection (public network in Fig. 1) and the multifunction peripheral is configured to perform the step of sending the device-related report by sending the device-related report to an electronic faxing service over the network

connection (paragraph [0036], where the core part controls the transmission of information, among others, of the facsimile portion through a network).

(5) regarding claim 9:

Homma '700 further discloses wherein the multifunction peripheral further comprises an encryption module and wherein multifunction peripheral is further configured to perform the step of encrypting the device-related report (paragraph [0076], where by the user having to enter a user ID and the system having to verify this ID with its records, the system is performing an encryption process).

(6) regarding claim 10:

Homma '700 further discloses wherein the multifunction peripheral further comprises an identification module (Fig. 6) and wherein multifunction peripheral is further configured to perform the steps of retrieving an identifier for the multifunction peripheral (paragraph [0073], where an user ID is used to associated a user with the use of a device in this case the multifunction device) and augmenting the device-related report with the identifier for the multifunction peripheral (paragraph [0076], lines 1-4, where the user ID is used to access the report information).

(7) regarding claim 12:

Homma '700 further discloses wherein the multifunction peripheral is configured to perform the step of requesting device-related information using the simple network management protocol (paragraph [0034], lines 15-18, where the device is capable of communicating through a network using SNMP).

(8) regarding claim 13:

Homma '700 further discloses wherein the multifunction peripheral is configured to perform the step of receiving device-related information from the network device using the simple network management protocol (paragraph [0034], lines 15-18, where the device is capable of communicating through a network using SNMP).

(9) regarding claim 14:

Homma '700 further discloses wherein the device-related information comprises one or more of device information (paragraph [0073]), device status, meter reading information, and consumables information.

(10) regarding claim 15:

Homma '700 further discloses wherein the multifunction peripheral is further configured to perform the step of accepting user configuration input (paragraph [0016], where the user ID has to be accepted by the device in order to properly communicate information), and wherein the user configuration input relates to one or more aspects of the collection of device-related information from the network device by the multifunction peripheral (paragraph [0016], and Fig. 7 where the user has the options to select his/her own configuration).

(11) regarding claim 16:

Homma '700 further discloses wherein the multifunction peripheral is further configured to perform the step of accepting user configuration input via a remote interface (paragraph [0016], where the user ID has to be accepted by the device in order to properly communicate information and Fig. 1, where the communication devices can be located remotely connected by a network), and wherein the user

configuration input relates to one or more aspects of the collection of device-related information from the network device by the multifunction peripheral (paragraph [0016], and Fig. 7 where the user has the options to select his/her own configuration).

(12) regarding claim 21:

Homma '700 further discloses wherein the recipient device is one of the group consisting of a fax machine, a computer (11 and 12, in Fig. 1), and dedicated hardware executing one of the group consisting of an email client, an http server, and https server, and an ftp server.

(13) regarding claim 24:

Homma '700 further discloses wherein the multifunction peripheral is configured to receive an acknowledgement over the network from the network device (paragraph [0076], lines 5-13, where the system receives a network confirmation if there is or there is not device information stored in memory).

(14) regarding claim 28:

Homma '700 further discloses a multifunction peripheral (100 in Fig. 1) configured to perform the steps of:

generating a device-related report based on the received device-related information and device-related information from the multifunction peripheral (paragraph [0074], where the information collected is being formatted in a record); and

sending said device-related report to a recipient device (paragraph [0076], lines 6-12, where if the information is stored in memory it is received by the requesting party),

Homma '700 discloses all the subject matter as described above except requesting device-related information from a network device over a network;

receiving device-related information from the network device over the network;

reading a meter of the multifunction peripheral to obtain meter information;

wherein the device-related information includes the meter information,

wherein the device-related report includes an identification of the multifunction peripheral.

However, Motoyama '247 teaches requesting device-related information from a network device over a network (column 9, lines 4-9, where the service machine request data and where the service machine could be any device and since Homma '700 discloses a multi-function peripheral, the machine is taken to be a multifunction device as stated in the primary reference, and as explained on column 21, lines 15-20 and 26-29, where the data structure resides on a; e.g. multifunction device, that is a possibility since the service machine contains information about another device as well as Fig. 25);

receiving device-related information from the network device over the network (column 8, line 63 through column 9, line 4, where the service machine receives information through a network 10 of the operations of other devices);

reading a meter of the multifunction peripheral to obtain meter information (Fig. 25, where reading the data structure is being interpreted as reading a meter);

wherein the device-related information includes the meter information (Fig. 25, data structure contains meter information such as No. of job, No. of pages, etc.),

wherein the device-related report includes an identification of the multifunction peripheral (1082 in Fig. 25).

Having a system of Homma '700 reference and then given the well-established teaching of Motoyama '247 reference, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the multifunction peripheral system of Homma '700 to include requesting device-related information from a network device over a network; receiving device-related information from the network device over the network; reading a meter of the multifunction peripheral to obtain meter information; wherein the device-related information includes the meter information, wherein the device-related report includes an identification of the multifunction peripheral as taught by Motoyama '247 because it would allow the multifunction device to detect other devices on the network and in case the MFP itself could not perform a job, it would know what are the capabilities of other devices in order to redirect or indicate the user where to redirect the job.

6.   Claims 5, 20, 22-23 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Homma (US 2001/0017700) and Motoyama et al. (US 6,631,247) as applied to claims above, and further in view of Iwase et al. (US 2002/0046247).

(1) regarding claim 5:

Homma '700 and Motoyama '247 disclose all the subject matter as described above except wherein the multi function peripheral further comprises an email module and wherein the multifunction peripheral is configured to perform the step of sending

said device-related report to the recipient device by sending, said device-related report to the recipient device via email using the email module.

However, Iwase '247 teaches wherein the multi function peripheral further comprises an email module (paragraph [0012], where the server apparatus contains the e-mail functionality) and wherein the multifunction peripheral is configured to perform the step of sending said device-related report to the recipient device by sending, said device-related report to the recipient device via email using the email module (paragraph [0012], where information is being send through the network by e-mail).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art a t the time the invention was made wherein the multi function peripheral further comprises an email module and wherein the multifunction peripheral is configured to perform the step of sending said device-related report to the recipient device by sending, said device-related report to the recipient device via email using the email module as taught by Iwase '247 in the system of Homma '700 and Motoyama '247. With this the system performance is enhanced by allowing communication among devices that may not be in the same place or even in the same country and still getting all the information contained in the report.

(2) regarding claim 20:

Homma '700 and Motoyama '247 disclose all the subject matter as described above except wherein the network device is a second multifunction peripheral.

However, Iwase '247 teaches wherein the network device is a second multifunction peripheral (4 in Fig. 1, where the system have two or more multifunction devices connected to the same network).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art a t the time the invention was made wherein the network device is a second multifunction peripheral as taught by Iwase '247 in the system of Homma '700 and Motoyama '247. With this, it becomes evident that in a system (as taught by Homma '700) that has a network where multiple devices can be connected to, it becomes clear that among those devices another multifunction device can be connected as shown by Iwase '247.

(3) regarding claims 22, 25 and 26:

Homma '700 discloses a multifunction peripheral (100 in Fig. 1) configured to perform the steps of:

generating a device-related report based on a device-related information (paragraph [0074], where the information collected is being formatted in a record); and

sending said device-related report to a recipient device (paragraph [0076], lines 6-12, where if the information is stored in memory it is received by the requesting party).

Homma '700 discloses all the subject matter as described above except requesting device-related information from a network device over a network;

receiving device-related information from the network device over the network;

However, Motoyama '247 teaches requesting device-related information from a network device over a network (column 9, lines 4-9, where the service machine request data and where the service machine could be any device and since Homma '700

discloses a multi-function peripheral, the machine is taken to be a multifunction device as stated in the primary reference, and as explained on column 21, lines 15-20 and 26-29, where the data structure resides on a; e.g. multifunction device, that is a possibility since the service machine contains information about another device as well as Fig. 25);

receiving device-related information from the network device over the network (column 8, line 63 through column 9, line 4, where the service machine receives information through a network 10 of the operations of other devices);

Having a system of Homma '700 reference and then given the well-established teaching of Motoyama '247 reference, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the multifunction peripheral system of Homma '700 to include requesting device-related information from a network device over a network and receiving device-related information from the network device over the network as taught by Motoyama '247 because it would allow the multifunction device to detect other devices on the network and in case the MFP itself could not perform a job, it would know what are the capabilities of other devices in order to redirect or indicate the user where to redirect the job.

Homma '700 and Motoyama '247 disclose all the subject matter as described above except having a network device distinct from the second network device.

However, Iwase '247 teaches having a network device distinct from the second network device (4 in Fig. 1, where the system have two or more multifunction devices connected to the same network).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art a t the time the invention was made having a network device distinct from the second network device as taught by Iwase '247 in the system of Homma '700 and Motoyama '247. With this, it becomes evident that in a system (as taught by Homma '700) that has a network where multiple devices can be connected to, it becomes clear that among those devices another multifunction device can be connected as shown by Iwase '247.

(4) regarding claim 23:

Homma '700 further discloses wherein the multifunction peripheral (100 in Fig. 1) is configured to perform the step of:

generating the device-related report based on said device-related information and said set of device-related information (paragraph [0074], where the information collected is being formatted in a record); and

sending said device-related report to the recipient device (paragraph [0076], lines 6-12, where if the information is stored in memory it is received by the requesting party).

Homma '700 discloses all the subject matter as described above except accessing a set of device-related information from the multifunction peripheral;

However, Motoyama '247 teaches accessing a set of device-related information from the multifunction peripheral (column 9, lines 4-9, where the service machine request data and where the service machine could be any device and since Homma '700 discloses a multi-function peripheral, the machine is taken to be a multifunction device as stated in the primary reference, and as explained on column 21, lines 15-20 and 26-29, where the data structure resides on a; e.g. multifunction device, that is a

possibility since the service machine contains information about another device as well as Fig. 25);

Having a system of Homma '700 reference and then given the well-established teaching of Motoyama '247 reference, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the multifunction peripheral system of Homma '700 to include accessing a set of device-related information from the multifunction peripheral as taught by Motoyama '247 because it would allow the multifunction device to detect other devices on the network and in case the MFP itself could not perform a job, it would know what are the capabilities of other devices in order to redirect or indicate the user where to redirect the job.

Homma '700 and Motoyama '247 disclose all the subject matter as described above except that the set of device-related information and the device-related report are from a second device.

However, Iwase '247 teaches that the set of device-related information and the device-related report are from a second device (4 in Fig. 1, where the system have two or more multifunction devices connected to the same network).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art a t the time the invention was made that the set of device-related information and the device-related report are from a second device as taught by Iwase '247 in the system of Homma '700. With this, it becomes evident that in a system (as taught by Homma '700) that has a network where multiple devices can be connected to, it becomes clear that

among those devices another multifunction device can be connected as shown by Iwase '247.

7.   Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Homma (US 2001/0017700) and Motoyama et al. (US 6,631,247) as applied to claims above, and further in view of Nagasaka et al. (US 6,725,300).

Homma '700 and Motoyama '247 disclose all the subject matter as described above except wherein the multifunction peripheral further comprises a hypertext transfer protocol module and wherein the multifunction peripheral is configured to perform the step of sending said device-related report to the recipient device by sending said device-related report to the recipient device via hypertext transfer protocol using the hypertext transfer protocol module.

However, Nagasaka '300 teaches wherein the multifunction peripheral further comprises a hypertext transfer protocol module and wherein the multifunction peripheral is configured to perform the step of sending said device-related report to the recipient device by sending said device-related report to the recipient device via hypertext transfer protocol using the hypertext transfer protocol module (column 32, lines 64-67 and column 33, lines 1-10, where http is being used for communications between devices).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made wherein the multifunction peripheral further comprises a hypertext transfer protocol module and wherein the multifunction peripheral is configured to perform the step of sending said device-related report to the recipient

device by sending said device-related report to the recipient device via hypertext transfer protocol using the hypertext transfer protocol module as taught by Nagasaka '300 in the system of Homma '700 and Motoyama '247. With this the system can use a standard way of communication through internet, thus facilitating the communication with remote devices.

8.   Claims 7, 11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Homma (US 2001/0017700) and Motoyama et al. (US 6,631,247) as applied to claims above, and further in view of Watkins (US 6,347,305).

(1) regarding claim 7:

Homma '700 and Motoyama '247 disclose all the subject matter as described above except wherein the multifunction peripheral further comprises a secure hypertext transfer protocol module and wherein the multifunction peripheral is configured to perform the step of sending said device-related report to the recipient device by sending said device-related report to the recipient device via secure hypertext transfer protocol using the secure hypertext transfer protocol module.

However, Watkins '305 teaches wherein the multifunction peripheral further comprises a secure hypertext transfer protocol module and wherein the multifunction peripheral is configured to perform the step of sending said device-related report to the recipient device by sending said device-related report to the recipient device via secure hypertext transfer protocol using the secure hypertext transfer protocol module (column 7, lines 5-17, where the email is connected to a secure page (https)).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made wherein the multifunction peripheral further comprises a secure hypertext transfer protocol module and wherein the multifunction peripheral is configured to perform the step of sending said device-related report to the recipient device by sending said device-related report to the recipient device via secure hypertext transfer protocol using the secure hypertext transfer protocol module as taught by Watkins '305 in the system of Homma '700 and Motoyama '247. With this the system can use a standard way of communication through internet, thus facilitating the communication with remote devices in a secure way.

(2) regarding claims 11 and 17:

Homma '700 and Motoyama '247 disclose all the subject matter as described above except wherein the multifunction peripheral is further configured to perform the step of requesting device-related information from a device at intervals defined by the user configuration input.

However, Watkins '305 teaches wherein the multifunction peripheral is further configured to perform the step of requesting device-related information from a device at intervals defined by the user configuration input (column 7, lines 5-8, where there is a predetermined number of times that information is going to be retrieve).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made wherein the multifunction peripheral is further configured to perform the step of requesting device-related information from a device at intervals defined by the user configuration input as taught by Watkins '305 in the system of

Homma '700 and Motoyama '247. With this the system has an organized way to retrieve information from different devices, thus preventing errors or discrepancies of information for the report.

9.   Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Homma (US 2001/0017700) and Motoyama et al. (US 6,631,247) as applied to claims above, and further in view of Takano (US 2004/0184108).

Homma '700 and Motoyama '247 disclose all the subject matter as described above except wherein the multifunction peripheral further comprises a file transfer protocol module and wherein the multifunction peripheral is configured to perform the step of sending said device-related report to the recipient device by sending said device-related report to the recipient device via file transfer protocol using the file transfer protocol module.

However, Takano '108 teaches wherein the multifunction peripheral further comprises a file transfer protocol module and wherein the multifunction peripheral is configured to perform the step of sending said device-related report to the recipient device by sending said device-related report to the recipient device via file transfer protocol using the file transfer protocol module (paragraph [0052], where by way of the ftp the system can communicate device-related information).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made wherein the multifunction peripheral further comprises a file transfer protocol module and wherein the multifunction peripheral is configured to perform the step of sending said device-related report to the recipient device by sending

said device-related report to the recipient device via file transfer protocol using the file

transfer protocol module as taught by Takano '108 in the system of Homma '700 and

Motoyama '247. With this the system can use a standard way of communication through

ftp, thus facilitating the data transfer with remote devices.

10.   Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Homma

(US 2001/0017700) and Motoyama et al. (US 6,631,247) as applied to claims above,

and further in view of Carter (WO 01/40907).

Homma '700 and Motoyama '247 disclose all the subject matter as described

above except wherein the multifunction peripheral is configured to perform the step of

generating the device-related report based in part on the user configuration input, and

wherein the multifunction peripheral is further configured to perform the step of sending

said device-related report to the recipient device at an interval defined by the user

configuration input.

However, Carter '907 teaches wherein the multifunction peripheral is configured

to perform the step of generating the device-related report based in part on the user

configuration input, and wherein the multifunction peripheral is further configured to

perform the step of sending said device-related report to the recipient device at an

interval defined by the user configuration input (page 12, lines 32-33 and page 13, lines

1-4, where the operator indicates when a particular information should be send to a

particular party).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made wherein the multifunction peripheral is configured to perform

the step of generating the device-related report based in part on the user configuration

input, and wherein the multifunction peripheral is further configured to perform the step

of sending said device-related report to the recipient device at an interval defined by the

user configuration input as taught by Carter '907 in the system of Homma '700 and

Motoyama '247. With this the system has an organized way to present information

about different devices, thus preventing errors or discrepancies of information for the

report.

11.   Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Homma

(US 2001/0017700) and Motoyama et al. (US 6,631,247) as applied to claims above,

and further in view of Swart (US 6,347,306).

          Homma '700 and Motoyama '247 disclose all the subject matter as described

above except wherein the multifunction peripheral further comprises a means for

executing instructions of a java application and the steps are performed by instructions

of a particular java application.

          However, Swart '306 teaches wherein the multifunction peripheral further

comprises a means for executing instructions of a java application and the steps are

performed by instructions of a particular java application (Fig. 3 and column 7, lines 48-

63).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made wherein the multifunction peripheral further comprises a means for

executing instructions of a java application and the steps are performed by instructions

of a particular java application as taught by Swart '306 in the system of Homma '700

and Motoyama '247. With this the system can use a standard way of communication

through internet, thus facilitating the communication with remote devices.

Conclusion

12.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to LENNIN R. RODRIGUEZ whose telephone number is

(571)270-1678. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 7:30am

- 6:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, King Poon can be reached on (571) 272-7440. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/King Y. Poon/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Lennin R Rodriguez/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625